

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
  - para. 0002, next-to-last line, it appears that "or with" should be simply, --or-- (note "using" on the preceding line);
  - para. 0003, line 6, it appears that "already" should be deleted;
  - para. 0004, line 5, it appears that "is an area" should be --in an area--;
  - para. 0005, lines 2-3, "there from" should be one word;
  - para. 0008, the reference to "patent claim 10" should be removed since the final numbering of the patent claims is not determined until the end of prosecution of the application;
  - para. 0013, line 2, the phrase "the overlap of" appears to be redundant in view of the phrase "overlaps with", occurring later on the same line;
  - para. 0014, line 2, it appears that "but only then, when" should be simply, --but only when--;
  - para. 0019, line 6, it appears that "be indicated" would be clearer as --is indicated-- or --may be indicated--;
  - para. 0025, line 1, it appears that "out then, when" should be simply, --out when--;
  - para. 0029, line 4, it appears that the second occurrence of "are" should be deleted (i.e., this occurrence of "are" appears to be redundant in view of the first occurrence);
  - para. 0038, next-to-last line, a comma should be inserted between "2a" and "2b";
  - para. 0038, next-to-last line, it appears that "equilateral" should be --isosceles-- (i.e., the boundary curves and the time line form a triangle with two, rather than three, equal sides); and
  - para. 0039, line 1, a comma should be inserted between "2a" and "2b".Appropriate correction is required.

2. The drawings are objected to because the blocks in Fig. 4 should be provided with "descriptive legends", per 37 CFR 1.84(o).

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure

must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

3. Claims 16-30 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(a) for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 16, lines 3-4, "the own vehicle" (one occurrence on each line) lacks antecedent basis, and it is unclear how "own" further defines "the...vehicle".

Claim 19, line 2, it appears that "is" should be --are--.

At the end of claim 19, "the projected movement tracks" lacks clear antecedent basis.

Claim 25, line 6, "the vehicle sensors" lacks antecedent basis.

Claim 28, line 2, the comma after "deactivated" should be deleted.

Claim 30, line 2, it appears that "imminent or already occurring of the door opening" would be clearer as --an imminent or already occurring door opening--, or something similar.

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 16-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 16, line 4, "detecting objects...in the environment of the...vehicle" is indefinite as to what constitutes the "environment" of a vehicle per se; i.e., does this include only objects within the vehicle (including, e.g., components of the vehicle itself), does it include only objects

either inside the vehicle or outside but within a predetermined proximity of the vehicle, does it include objects in areas where the vehicle is normally driven (e.g. along roads and highways), etc.

In claim 23, line 2, it is unclear whether "manual switching off" refers to the "process" (or associated apparatus) per se, or to the "vehicle" as a whole.

In claim 25, line 4, it is unclear what is meant by "environment sensors" in the context of sensing a condition(s) pertaining to a vehicle; i.e., it is unclear if "environment" implies anything about the particular type(s) of sensor(s) being used, and/or anything about the particular vehicle-related condition(s) or parameter(s) being sensed (e.g., conditions concerning the operational status of the vehicle itself or of a component of the vehicle itself, and/or conditions concerning the status of objects or parameters internal to and/or external to the vehicle).

In claim 25, line 9, "an overlapping of the probability space" is indefinite as to what the "probability space" (of the vehicle) is overlapping with; note the "probability paths...for the detected objects" on line 8.

In claim 26, line 2, "the movement path" is indefinite as to which of the previously-recited "movement paths" is intended (note in claim 25, "movement paths...for the detected objects" on line 5 and "movement path...of the vehicle" on line 6).

In claim 28, last line, it is unclear whether "is manually switched off" refers to the "collision monitoring device" (see line 1) or to the "vehicle" as a whole.

6. Claims 16-30 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, and/or the objection(s) under 37 CFR 1.75(a), set forth in this Office action.

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The prior art cited by applicant has been considered. Bartels et al (US 2005/280518) appears to be related to DE 10261622 A1, cited by applicant. McLain et al (US 2005/280284), Dickmann et al (US 2004/200149) and Mochida et al (US 4458446) are cited to further show the state of the art.

Art Unit: 2612

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas J. Mullen, Jr. whose telephone number is 571-272-2965. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30 AM to 4 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel Wu, can be reached on (571) 272-2964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Thomas J. Mullen, Jr./  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2612